REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for reviewing the present application.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1-37 have been cancelled.

Claims 38 - 67 are new. Claims 38 to 45 are directed to a method for retrieving data related to versions of files organized in a configuration from the perspective of a proxy device. Claims 46 to 53 are directed to a method for retrieving data related to versions of files organized in a configuration from the perspective of a server device. Claims 54 to 60 are directed to a system for retrieving data related to versions of files organized in a configuration from the perspective of a proxy device. Claims 61 to 67 are directed to a system for retrieving data related to versions of files organized in a configuration from the perspective of a server device. Support for these new claims can be found in the application as published, as will be discussed in further detail below.

No new subject matter is believed to have been added by way of these amendments.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter et al. (US 6,026,474, hereinafter Carter), in view of Hino (US 6,185,563, hereinafter Hino). Claims 17, 18 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebata et al. (US 6,513,061, hereinafter Ebata), in view of Hino. Claims 1-3, 6-16, 19-21, and 24-36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hino, in view of either Ebata or Carter. Claim 37 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter in view of Hino, and in further view of Ebata. As noted above, Applicant has cancelled all previously presented claims and thus these rejections are rendered moot.

Notwithstanding the above, Applicant believes new claims 38-67 are believed to be patentably distinguished over Carter, Hino, Ebata and combinations thereof.

New independent claim 38 recites, among other things, a method for retrieving data related to versions of files organized in a configuration. Support for this is found at paragraph

9

[0028] in the application as published. The proxy device is arranged between the server device and one or more clients, as supported in paragraph [0026] in the application as published. The proxy cache at the proxy device stores bulk data and meta data, whereby the bulk data comprises the versions of files themselves, and the meta data comprises information about the organisation and properties of the files into a versioned system. Support for this is found at paragraphs [0028] and [0029]. The proxy cache is registered with a list of listeners maintained by the server device in order to update the proxy cache when changes are made at the server device to the data related to versions of files, with the changes being controlled by only the server device. Support for this is found at paragraph [0031]. The proxy cache is enabled to carry out a number of things: it is enabled to receive an update from the server device according to changes made to the data related to versions of files; it is enabled to be updated using the update to thereby synchronize the proxy cache with the server device and other proxies connected to the server device; and it is enabled to provide the update to the one or more clients for synchronizing one or more client-based caches. Support for this is found at paragraphs [0031] and [0038]. After the proxy cache is enabled, the proxy device receives a request from one of the clients for a desired file version or set of meta data. The proxy device then returns the desired file version or set of meta data if it is in the proxy cache, or, if it is not in the proxy cache, forwards the request to the server device. Support for this is found in paragraphs [0036] and [0037]. In this way, the proxy device is capable of obtaining one or more versions of files or meta data related to such files organized in a versioned file system on behalf of a client device. This avoids the client having to access the information directly from the server and enables the server to have full control over the data. At the same time, the proxy cache enables bulk data and meta data to be stored such that if this data is requested and is already available at the proxy device, it can simply be returned without having to request it again from the server device.

In so far as new independent claims 46, 54 and 61 are similar to new independent claim 38, Applicant notes that the support for claims 46, 54 and 61 correspond to the paragraphs in the published application as noted above.

Carter describes a shared client-side web cache that is provided by implementing a file system shared between nodes. Hino describes a client-server electronic filing system, where the server performs check-in check-out management on documents that two or more clients share and restrains the check-out of the same document by two or more clients. Ebata describes an internet having a server for providing service, a client for receiving the service, a

plurality of proxy servers for access to the server. In contrast to the invention claimed, none of Carter, Hino or Ebata mention a proxy cache for storing bulk data and meta data. Nor do the cited references mention a proxy cache that is registered at a list of listeners at the server device in order to update the proxy cache when changes are made at the server device to the data related to versions of files. The cited references also do not mention enabling the proxy cache to receive updates from the server device so that it can be synchronized with the server device, let alone enable the proxy to then synchronize one or more connected client-based caches. Moreover, the cited references do not combine the features of the proxy device thus claimed with the retrieval of a desired file version or set of meta data based on a request from the client. In fact, as previously argued, none of these references address issues associated with multiple versions of the same file or meta data related to such files. It can be appreciated that the enabled synchronization increases the chance that the desired file version or set of meta data may be in the proxy cache. If it is not in the proxy cache, then a request is forwarded to the server device so that it may obtain the desired file version or set of meta data.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, it is believed that the new claims stand patentably distinguished over the cited references.

Applicant requests early reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WENDY M SLADE
Attorney/Agent for Applicant
Registration No. 53604

Date: August 12, 2009

DOWELL & DOWELL, P.C.
Suite 406, 2111 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22314
USA

Tel: (703) 415-2555
Fax: (703) 415-2559